APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,065	04/27/2001	Bernhard L. Convent	STL 920000073US2	1668

7590	11/16/2005

David W. Victor
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR LLP
315 S.Beverly Drive; Suite 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

EXAMINER
SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/845,065	CONVENT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 September 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-45 are presented for examination. Claims 43-45 are new.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the

fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final

rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under

37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid,

the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37

CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/02/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in

this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application
for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention
thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application
by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2),

and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4.   Claims 1-11, 13-25, 27-39, and 41-45 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Diamond et al. (6,591,295)

(hereinafter Diamond).

5.   As per claims 1, 15, and 29, Diamond discloses a method, system, and

article of manufacture for enabling access to data, comprising:

        receiving a call from a client to invoke a remote

interface method (111, fig 1, col 3, lines 37-52);

        accessing, with a remote interface implementation (111, fig 1, col 3,

lines 37-52), parameters from the received call in response to the

invocation of the remote interface method (111, fig 1, col 2; lines 5-

21; lines 37-59; col 3, lines 37-52);

        generating a stored procedure call (col 3, lines 35-53) with the

accessed parameters as input parameters (111, 112, fig 1, col 2; lines 5-21;

lines 37-59; col 3, lines 37-52) of the stored procedure (111, 112, fig 1, col

2; lines 5-21; lines 37-59; col 3, lines 37-52);

        transferring the stored procedure call to a stored procedure named by

the call to execute (111, fig 1, col 2; lines 5-21; lines 37-59; col 3, lines 37-

52);

receiving output from the stored procedure (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25);

inserting the received output from the stored procedure into a data object (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25); and

returning the data object to the client (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25).

6.   As per claims 2, 16, and 30, Diamond discloses the stored procedure executes in a database server and generates the output (col 3, lines 32-35; lines 38-53), wherein the output is capable of comprising output that is a member of the set of output comprising one or more result sets of data from the database table and one or more output parameters resulting from stored procedure operations performed on data in the database table (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25).

7.   As per claims 3, 17, and 31, Diamond discloses processing, with the remote interface implementation, an input mapping to determine the parameters in the client call to use as input parameters to the stored procedure call (col 2, lines 1-21; lines 37-49).

8.   As per claims 4, 18, and 32, Diamond discloses receiving the stored procedure output after the stored procedure program completes execution (col 2, lines 1-21; lines 37-49; col 7, lines 43-44, outputting result after completion of execution of stored procedure is inherent).

9.   As per claims 5, 19, and 33, Diamond discloses processing an output mapping indicating how the stored procedure output is mapped to the data object (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, inherent in the java application result-set).

10.   As per claims 6, 20, and 34, Diamond discloses the output is capable of including result sets and parameters, wherein the output mapping indicates an order (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, inherent in the java application interfacing with database).

11.   As per claims 7, 21, and 35, Diamond discloses generating metadata describing the stored procedure output included in the data object; and adding the metadata to the data object (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, inherent in the java application interfacing with database).

12.   As per claims 8, 22, and 36, Diamond discloses processing, with the

client, the metadata in the received data object to determine how to access

the stored procedure output from the data object (elements of fig 2, col 2,

lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, result set and

metadata).

13.   As per claims 9, 23, and 37, Diamond discloses the data object is

comprised of multiple elements, wherein the stored procedure output

includes rows of data from at least one result set, wherein inserting the

stored procedure output into the data object further comprises inserting data

from each column in each row in each result set to one element in the data

object, and wherein the metadata defines structure and types of data in

each element (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-

44; col 5, lines 1-25, result set and metadata) .

14.   As per claims 10, 24, and 38, Diamond discloses wherein the data

object is comprised of multiple elements, and wherein the stored procedure

output is capable of including multiple output parameters, wherein inserting

the stored procedure output into the data object further comprises inserting

each output parameter into one element in the data object, and wherein the

metadata provides information on structure and type of the data in each element (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, result set and metadata).

15.   As per claims 11, 25, and 39, Diamond discloses the client only receives one data object with stored procedure output in response to the call (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, result set is one data object).

16.   As per claims 13, 27, and 41, Diamond discloses a method, system, and article of manufacture for making stored procedure programs available to application programs, comprising:

determining one stored procedure program generating output needed by one application program (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 3, lines 35-53);

generating a remote interface implementation to respond to a remote interface method capable of receiving a call from the application program including data and invoking a stored procedure in a database server with the data from the application program used as input (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; 37-49; col 3, lines 35-53); and

generating an output mapping for the remote interface implementation

to use to determine how to insert the stored procedure output into a data

object that may be used by the application program (elements of fig 2, col 2,

lines 5-21; 37-49; col 3, lines 35-53).

17.   As per claims 14, 28 and 42, Diamond discloses the generated remote

interface implementation inserts metadata into the data object providing

information on the stored procedure output inserted into the data object

(elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5,

lines 1-25, result set is one data object).

18.   As per claim 43, 44, and 45, Diamond discloses the stored procedures

executes in a database server and wherein the received output comprises

output from a database, wherein the database server and the remote

interface implementation are implemented on a same machine (col 5,

lines25-56), wherein the remote interface implementation performs the

operations of generating the stored procedure call, transferring the

procedure call, receiving the output, inserting the received output from the

stored procedure, and returning the data object to the client (elements of

fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, result

set).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis

for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not
> identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this
> title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
> patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
> person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter
> pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which
> the invention was made.

20.   Claims 12, 26, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Diamond et al. (6,591,295) (hereinafter Diamond) in view

of Clegg et al. (6,356,946) (hereinafter Clegg).

21.   As per claims 12, 26, and 40, Diamond discloses wherein the remote

interface implementation is implemented as a Enterprise JavaBean (211, fig

2, col9, lines 18-23). However, Diamond fails to disclose the data object

comprises a Java serializable object. Serialiazble object is well known in the

art, i.e, Diamond disclosure of serializing the output using Sybase Tabular

Data Stream. For example, Clegg discloses the data object comprises a Java

serializable object (col 4, lines 27-35). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine the

teaching of Diamond and Clegg because Clegg's use of Java object

serialization would provide Diamond's system methodology for streaming to

client objects stored and managed remotely, so that the objects may be

executed or manipulated locally at the clients.

Response to Arguments

22.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-42 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

23.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,438,559

U.S. Patent 6,112,025

U.S. Patent 6,006,235

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications

from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose

telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

MAS